

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 028 898

RE 001 700

Junior High Summer Institutes, New York City. It Works.

Spons Agency-Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education;
Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Div. of Compensatory Education.

Report No-OE-37026

Pub Date [69]

Note-19p.

Available from-Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402
(OE-37026, \$.25)

EDRS Price MF-\$0.25 HC Not Available from EDRS.

Descriptors-*Compensatory Education Programs, Guidance Personnel, *Junior High Schools, Library Services,
Reading Skills, Remedial Mathematics, *Remedial Programs, School Personnel, *Summer Institutes, Teacher
Aides

A summer program designed for sixth, seventh, and eighth graders recommended as needing remediation or repetition met for three consecutive 90-minute sessions daily for 5 weeks. Regular school personnel staffed the 11 New York City schools designated as Summer Institutes and were assisted by guidance counselors and educational aides. Small classes and special services, including library services, were provided. Pretesting and post-testing were done with alternate forms of the Metropolitan Achievement Battery. For reading instruction students were grouped into basic and intensive reading programs according to pretest reading levels. They worked within a tightly structured curriculum emphasizing reading skills and mechanics. Emphasis in mathematics classes was on repetition of grades failed, with students grouped according to the grade they failed. Other subjects taught were English, foreign languages, sciences, and social studies. Some Institutes also offered subjects of a vocational nature. Results of a 1967 evaluation of six of the schools showed an average gain in reading of .3 year and an average gain in mathematics of .5 year. Attitudes and opinions of both staff and students concerning the program were favorable. References are included. (MD)

ED028898

DE-37026
DE/BESF
TITLE 1

**JUNIOR HIGH
SUMMER INSTITUTES
New York City**

RE001 700

**Secondary Program
in Compensatory Education 4**

1. Preschool Program in Compensatory Education

Preschool Program, Fresno, California OE-37034
Infant Education Research Project, Washington, D.C. OE-37033
Early Childhood Project, New York City OE-37027
Perry Preschool Project, Ypsilanti, Michigan OE-37035
Diagnostically Based Curriculum, Bloomington, Indiana OE-37024
Academic Preschool, Champaign, Illinois OE-37041

2. Elementary Program in Compensatory Education

More Effective Schools, New York City OE-37042
Intensive Reading Instructional Teams, Hartford, Connecticut OE-37038
After School Study Centers, New York City OE-37036
Self-Directive Dramatization Project, Joliet, Illinois OE-37037
Project Concern, Hartford, Connecticut OE-37030
Elementary Reading Centers, Milwaukee, Wisconsin OE-37031
School and Home Program, Flint, Michigan OE-37023
Programmed Tutorial Reading Project, Indianapolis, Indiana OE-37029
Speech and Language Development Program, Milwaukee, Wisconsin OE-37028

3. Elementary-Secondary Program in Compensatory Education

Homework Helper Program, New York City OE-37025
Communication Skills Center Project, Detroit, Michigan OE-37039

4. Secondary Program in Compensatory Education

Junior High Summer Institutes, New York City OE-37026
Project R-3, San Jose, California OE-37040
College Bound Program, New York City OE-37032

For information on any of the booklets listed, please write to Information Officer,
Division of Compensatory Education, U.S. Office of Education, Washington, D.C. 20202

IT WORKS

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE
PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION
POSITION OR POLICY.

JUNIOR HIGH SUMMER INSTITUTES NEW YORK CITY

One of a Series of
Successful Compensatory Education Programs

U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
Robert H. Finch, Secretary

Office of Education
Peter P. Muirhead, Acting Commissioner

FOREWORD

This project report is part of an independent study of selected exemplary programs for the education of disadvantaged children completed by the American Institutes for Research in the Behavioral Sciences, Palo Alto, Calif., under contract with the U.S. Office of Education.

The researchers report this project significantly improved the educational attainment of the disadvantaged children involved. Other communities, in reviewing the educational needs of the disadvantaged youngsters they serve, may wish to use this project as a model - adapting it to their specific requirements and resources.

Division of Compensatory Education
Bureau of Elementary and Secondary
Education

JUNIOR HIGH SUMMER INSTITUTES IN NEW YORK CITY

Introduction

Students who had failed specific school subjects or who were retarded in reading took summer courses in the appropriate subjects. Instruction in a course was 90 minutes per day, 5 days per week, for 5 1/2 weeks. Small classes, educational aides, guidance counselors, and other special services were provided.

The students had just completed the sixth, seventh, or eighth grade, and were from intermediate and junior high schools, public and nonpublic. They were recommended to the institutes by their home schools on the basis of their need for remediation or repetition. All were drawn from poverty areas of New York City, such as Harlem and Bedford-Stuyvesant. Many were Negro or Puerto Rican.

Summer junior high schools staffed by regular school personnel have existed in New York City since 1960. In 1967, 11 of the 22 summer schools received federal support, including extra services such as teacher aides and guidance counselors (see Fox, 1967). These eleven schools were called Summer Institutes, and the description refers only to them.

Achievement in reading and mathematics classes was measured by the Metropolitan Achievement battery, in six of the schools (called the evaluation sample). The mean gains of the pupils were .3 year in reading and .5 year in mathematics, over a 5-week instructional period.

Personnel

A. Project Coordinator. (A licensed school principal during the regular school year.)

He administered the 11 project schools as well as the other 11 summer schools and the special Creative Arts Academy. He was responsible for setting up the schools, including registration procedures, and for coordinating the activities of the total program. He prepared a report which included recommendations for future programs (Fox, 1967).

B. Supervisors.

They administered and supervised the instructional program, including the educational aides.

C. Principals. (One per school; those in the evaluation sample were all licensed and experienced as principals. The summer school was not necessarily the same school as the home school of each.)

Each principal administered the program in one school with the full-time assistance of a licensed assistant principal.

D. Teachers. (In the sample schools, 83 percent were licensed in their teaching area and had classroom experience.)

E. Educational Aides (244 in 11 schools, or approximately one per teacher. Eligibility requirements stated that "only those recent high school graduates who reside in highly impacted poverty areas, and who are in financial need to continue their education are eligible...." Recommended by their high school counselors and others, many wished to go into teaching of social work. Forty percent of the aides were male, 60 percent, female. About 60 percent were Negro.)

They worked in a school near their residence and assisted the teachers with clerical work and by working with individual students.

F. Guidance Counselors. (11; licensed as counselors.)

G. Librarians. (11 in the six schools of the evaluation sample.)

H. Reading Consultants. (One in each of the six sample schools.)

Methodology: General

In all 11 institutes, students were given the opportunity to make up failure in credit subjects: English, mathematics, foreign languages, science, social studies. There were also non-credit classes in reading. In addition, some of the institutes offered credit classes in industrial arts, typing, and music and noncredit classes in English as a second language.

The school day consisted of three consecutive 90-minute periods. Teachers worked all three periods and pupils were each registered for one or two of these periods, i.e., they were each registered for one or two courses. There were about 20 students per class. The educational aides worked a 5 1/2 hour day at \$2 per hour. The library was open during the school day to provide students a quiet place to study as well as a source of materials.

In the reading program, students were grouped without regard for age or nominal grade level. Those reading below grade level 3.5 were placed in the Basic Reading Program, which emphasized skills and mechanics of reading. The Intensive Reading Program was for students reading between grade levels 3.6 and 5.5. In both of these programs the curriculum was highly structured, with detailed directives spelled out for every part of the 90-minute period. Each teacher received a teaching manual from the reading coordinator.

A series of materials developed by the staff of the Junior High School Reading Project of New York City (see quoted sources) were used as the basis for these programs; in 1968 there was also a specially prepared Reading Handbook (Weiner, 1968).

In the mathematics classes, students were grouped by the grade level in which they had just failed math. The curriculum was considered as repetition rather than as remediation: the failed courses were retaught. In the summer program for the sixth grade, the first half of the regular year's course was taught including the fundamentals; in the seventh and eighth grades, the stress was on the second half-year, which contained more enrichment items.

The courses were structured according to handbooks prepared for the regular year's course in the Curriculum Bulletin series of the Board of Education of the City of New York (see quoted sources).

As compared to the reading classes, the observed math classes were generally rated as not linked to student experience, and as teacher-dominated, with fewer children volunteering discussion and with discipline maintained by teacher authority. (The evaluators do not speculate as to what degree these differences may be inherent in the subject matter, in the interaction between subject matter and slow learners, or in the heterogeneous grouping of the math classes, which 65 percent of the math teachers felt to be an unsatisfactory grouping arrangement.)

It may be noted that in the 5 1/2 weeks program there was time for about 4 weeks of intensive instruction in the evaluated classrooms, since 3 days were taken up with pretesting in week 1, and

three with post-testing in the final week. The 4 weeks' instruction of 90-minute periods was considered equivalent to about 8 weeks or 2 months of instruction during the regular school year.

The budget for materials was limited, in favor of spending money for staff. Consequently, principals were advised to bring materials from their home schools.

A separate feature of the project was the establishment in one school of a summer Creative Arts Academy. This was for students from deprived areas who were achieving satisfactorily in school and who displayed potential in some field of the arts. The Academy was staffed by visiting artists and performers as well as regular school personnel.

Methodology: Specific Examples

A. Diagnosis

A careful diagnosis should be made of each child's reading problems. This may be done by means of:

An analysis of the results of the Metropolitan Reading Test

A Phonics Survey

An informal reading test

Although the Metropolitan Reading Test was not designed as a diagnostic test, by checking each pupil's errors against the item analysis the teacher can analyze the pupil's strengths and weaknesses.

Graph paper may be used to chart the errors made by a class. From this chart the teacher can select those skills which should be emphasized. Groups can also be formed according to the needs of the children.

The informal textbook test may be given to:

- a) decide the pupil's instructional level
- b) place new pupils
- c) further diagnose reading problems such as word-attack skills and comprehension

B. Basic Reading Program

If the class consists of non-readers, teach a skill lesson (or experience chart) and a phonics lesson each session.

If the pupils are not complete non-readers and are reading on approximately a third grade level, modify the program by teaching the word meaning and comprehension skills listed below. Teach the phonics as needed. (Use phonics diagnostic chart.) Have another reading activity each session using other reading materials.

<u>Lesson #</u>	<u>Skill</u>
Phonics	
3, 9, 15	Initial consonants
21, 27, 33	Final consonants
45, 51, 57	Double consonant blends
63	Long vowels
69	Short vowels
103, 109	Triple consonant blends
127	Vowel digraphs
133	Specific consonant combinations
139	Irregular consonant digraphs
145	Silent consonants
151	Inflectional endings
187	Irregular consonant combinations
193	Irregular vowel
199	Diphthongs
Comprehension and word meaning	
7	Main idea of a sentence
13	Understanding sentences - phrases - when, where
19	Understanding sentences - phrases - how, why
31	Understanding whole sentences
34	Multiple meanings of familiar words
46	Exact meaning of a word
49	Main idea of a paragraph - title
55	Main idea of a paragraph - first and last sentence
58, 64	Skimming
67	General significance of a paragraph
70, 76	Following directions
87	Word meaning - synonym and definition clues
91, 104	Predict outcomes

<u>Lesson #</u>	<u>Skill</u>
93	Word meaning - anticipation of meaning
110	Inferences
105, 111, 117	Main idea
121	Meaning of words - details
129, 135, 141	Understanding sentences with clauses
147	Cue words introducing details
153	Sequence of events
159	Details that illustrate main idea

The workbooks may be used as application material. Pupils, however, are not to write in the workbooks but are to use notebooks. Other application materials should be added.

C. Intensive Reading Program: Comprehension and Structural Analysis Skills

One comprehension or structural analysis skill should be taught each day for a period of about 30 minutes. Lesson plans for each skill may be found on the corresponding pages of the IRP Manual.

Applications - The IRP workbooks may be used if the pupils have not already used them. The pages correspond to the numbers of the lesson plans. Programmed Reading by Jerold Glassman may be also used as an IRP application. A set of 35 has been provided for each school. Be certain that the pupils understand the format before working in Programmed Reading. These skills may also be reinforced in other reading selections.

Comprehension

<u>Unit #</u>	<u>Skill</u>
1	Word meaning - contextual clues - synonyms
3	Word meaning - contextual clues - definitions
6	Word meaning - contextual clues - antonyms
10	Following simple directions
12	Following a longer list of directions
15	Word meaning - experience and summary clues
17	Main idea of a sentence
19	Main idea and details of a sentence - when, where
25	Main idea and details of a sentence - how, why
23	Context clues - multiple meanings
34	Main idea of a paragraph - title

Unit #Comprehension

42	Main idea of a paragraph - first and last sentence
44	Main idea of a paragraph - at beginning and repeated at end
50	Main idea of a paragraph - in the body
52	Main idea of a paragraph - part of a sentence
57	Main idea of a paragraph - inferred meaning
61	Sequence of ideas
65	Figurative language
67	Skimming
74	Organization and classification
75	How to study

Structural AnalysisUnit #Skill

32	Root words and endings
40	Compound words
48	Prefixes
56	Suffixes
58	Prefixes and suffixes

Phonics

Phonics should be taught as needed for approximately 10-13 minutes.

13	Hard and soft c
16	Long vowels
18	Long vowels - a, i
20	Long vowels - o, u
22	Long vowels - 2 vowels together
24	Short vowels - a
26	Short vowels - e
28	Short vowels - i, y
30	Short vowels - o, u
33	Consonant blends - ac, sk, sl, sm
35	Consonant blends - sn, ap, st, sw
37	Consonant blends - br, cr, dr
39	Consonant blends - fr, gr, pr, tr
43	Consonant blends - gl, pl, sl
45	Consonant blends - sc, sq, sp
47	Consonant blends - spl, str

Phonics

Unit

49	Digraphs - ch
51	Digraphs - sh, th
53	Digraphs - ph, wh
55	Digraphs - th

Directed Reading Activity

Each Directed Reading Activity may be used as an additional reinforcement for specific skills.

5	Green Cheese - synonym and definition clues
14	The Boy Who Would Not Give Up - antonym clues
21	Loaf of Bread - experience clue
31	The Best Man Won - multiple meanings
38	A Story Inside a Story - root words, endings s ed, ing
46	Daylight Saving Time - compound words
54	The Old Man's Treasure - prefixes
59	The Necklace - prefixes and suffixes
63	Snakes - main idea sentence
68	Tales of Robin Hood - figures of speech
72	Cask of Wine - predicting outcome
76	Flight of the Bell X-4 - use of context clues to find word meaning

Do not permit the pupils to write in the IRP workbooks. Their work should be done in notebooks.

Evaluation

A. Measures of Achievement

The evaluation by Fox and Weinberg (1967) was based upon those students in the six sample institutes for whom both pretest and post-test data were available from alternate forms of the Metropolitan Achievement Tests.

In reading, the mean gain for 479 pupils was .3 year, from 5.1 to 5.4, over an instructional period of 5 weeks. The expected gain during 5 weeks of the regular school year for disadvantaged pupils would be less than .1 year, but instruction would not be as intensive.

In mathematics, the mean gain for 339 pupils was .5 year, from 5.7 to 6.2, over the same instructional period with the same expected gain.

The distribution of these gains is reflected in Tables 1 and 2.

Table 1
PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF CHILDREN (N 479) BY GRADE LEVEL
IN READING IN THE JUNIOR HIGH SUMMER INSTITUTES PROGRAM

Grade Level	Pretest %	Posttest %
10.0 +	1	2
9.0 - 9.9	4	3
8.0 - 8.9	5	8
7.0 - 7.9	8	12
6.0 - 6.9	15	13
5.0 - 5.9	20	25
4.0 - 4.9	25	20
3.0 - 3.9	22	17

[Adapted from data contained in Fox (1967)]

The figures given in Fox and Weinberg's report indicate that some of the changes may have been artifactual. In particular, "losses" recorded for the more able students in reading may well be the result of inaccurate measurement of this group by the Intermediate form of the Metropolitan Achievement Test. The fact that different reading programs were used at different levels may have influenced the pattern of scores too. Fox and Weinberg came to the conclusion that the gains made were indeed of both statistical and educational significance, although no level of confidence is actually stated.

Table 2
PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF CHILDREN (N 339) BY GRADE LEVEL
IN MATHEMATICS IN THE JUNIOR HIGH SUMMER INSTITUTES PROGRAM

Grade Level	Pretest %	Posttest %
10.0 +	0	2
9.0 - 9.9	1	1
8.0 - 8.9	5	12
7.0 - 7.9	9	13
6.0 - 6.9	24	28
5.0 - 5.9	35	26
4.0 - 4.9	20	15
3.0 - 3.9	6	3

[Adapted from data contained in Fox (1967)]

Their evaluation is confirmed by the report of the coordinator (Fox, 1967) in which the figures for the whole Summer Junior High School program, of which the Institutes were a part, show median gains of about 9 months.

B. Other Evaluation Indices

The Fox and Weinberg team also assessed the quality of instruction, staff attitudes and opinions, children's attitudes and opinions, attendance, and the functioning and effectiveness of the educational aides.

They reported [pages 72 and 73] that:

"The overall evaluation of the Summer Institute program was consistently positive.... The aspects of the teaching-learning process that were evaluated were rated as average

or better than average in quality; staff morale was good; and children's attitudes and responses were generally positive. Staff and observers agreed that children benefited from the program."

C. Modifications

Fox and Weinberg (1967) gathered opinions and suggestions extensively from staff and students, and distilled these into a set of recommendations for future implementation of the program. The recommendations seem to fall into two major categories:

One set of recommendations seems connected with the fact that the grant supporting the Institutes was not announced until June 1. Consequently, much planning was done at essentially the last minute. Recommendations for future include: better planning for full and effective use of library, guidance counselors, and educational aides; a clearer definition of roles generally; earlier ordering of materials; better orientation of teachers and other staff.

The other set of recommendations seems aimed at enriching the program beyond being essentially a replication of the regular school program. Recommendations include: a more flexible schedule rather than 90 minutes for each subject; greater individualization of instruction through diagnostic testing and an increased number of educational aides; distribution of paperbacks to help students start a personal library; more curriculum specialists to provide inservice and preservice training, assistance, and supervision for the teachers; additional innovative instructional materials, both software and hardware.

The program coordinator, Bernard Fox, in his annual report (Fox, 1967), supported many of these recommendations, and listed other innovations which he thought would improve the total program:

1. A "Talking Typewriter Reading Institute;"
2. A paid teacher-training program for teachers of reading;
3. The introduction on a pilot basis of the Initial Teaching Alphabet method of teaching reading;
4. The use of teaching machines in reading along with other materials not in common use during the regular school year;

5. The organization of a committee to develop a specific scope and sequence for the English Language Arts and another committee to do the same for English as a Second Language;
6. The introduction of a non-credit course in corrective mathematics;
7. The organization of a Mathematics-Science Academy for gifted pupils;
8. The teaching of foreign language as a non-credit exploratory course;
9. The use of a foreign language laboratory on a pilot basis in one school;
10. The expansion of the typewriting program to two teachers in those schools where a second typewriting room is available;
11. The initiation of a program for the circulation of library books as part of the summer instructional program.

Budget

A realistic budget is difficult to construct for this program, since the members of schools, teachers' aides, and pupils vary from year to year depending on demand. The total program, including the Institutes, cost \$750,000 in 1967, to serve about 15,000 pupils. This is a per pupil cost of \$50. No separate figure is available for the Institutes.

To staff a similar program, provision would have to be made for a coordinator, instructional supervisors, principals and teachers, educational aides, and support personnel such as counselors, librarians, reading consultants, and custodial staff.

Materials used in the program were drawn almost entirely from the regular day schools in 1967, so that over 95 percent of the budget was spent on salaries.

Quoted Sources

Board of Education of the City of New York. Curriculum Bulletin, Nos. 3a and 3b, 1966-67. (Mathematics, 7th Year, Parts 1 and 2.)

*Fox, B. A. Report of the Summer Junior High School, Institutes, Academy. New York: Board of Education of the City of New York, September 1967.

*Fox, D. J., and Weinberg, E. Summer schools for junior high and intermediate school pupils. New York: Center for Urban Education, November 1967.

Junior High School Reading Project. Basic reading program: A structured approach in the teaching of reading skills. Teachers' manual and books 1, 2, and 3. New York: Board of Education of the City of New York, 1966(?).

Junior High School Reading Project. Intensive reading program: A structured approach in the teaching of reading skills. Teachers' manual and books 1 and 2. New York: Board of Education of the City of New York, (1966?).

Weiner, A. Reading handbook: Summer junior high school. New York: Board of Education of the City of New York, 1968.

For More Information

Dr. Bernard Fox
Board of Education
110 Livingston Street
Brooklyn, New York 11201

* The Office of Education is collecting this material for placement in the ERIC system. Items may be obtained either in microfiche or hard copy.